

# The Sun.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1897.

Subscriptions by Mail Post-Paid.  
DAILY, per Month..... \$3.00  
DAILY, per Year..... 36.00  
SUNDAY, per Year..... 12.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year..... 48.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month..... 4.00  
Postage to foreign countries added.  
THE SUN, New York City.  
PARK—Kiosque No. 12, Near Grand Hotel.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the Sun and New York Associated Press is at 91 to 99 Ann street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

## Mr. Cleveland and the Perrine Claim.

It is possible that the last days of Mr. CLEVELAND's term will be marked, if not by a personal scandal of disturbing character, at least by the shadow of a scandal like unto those which clouded Washington and the Republican record during the period between 1869 and 1877.

On Monday next the Senate Committee on Public Lands will begin an investigation of the circumstances under which the Department of the Interior has recently issued to the PERRINE heirs a patent covering about twenty-three acres of Florida lands, said to be valuable and to be occupied at present by settlers in good faith; the most conspicuous of the PERRINE heirs who were thus brought suddenly into possession of these lands being the step-father of the President's wife.

This PERRINE claim is nearly sixty years old. The original PERRINE was a New York botanist who procured from the Twenty-fifth Congress in 1838 the grant of an enormous tract of then arid land in the Seminole country, his plan being to attempt there the cultivation of various tropical plants and fruits. The condition of the grant was that every section of the territory thus acquired should be peopled by immigration within eight years. This Dr. HENRY PERRINE was killed by the Indians about two years after the passage of the act of Congress, and the conditions as to settlement were not fulfilled. In 1841 his widow, ANN F. PERRINE, went to the Twenty-sixth Congress to ask for an extension of time. It is alleged that a few families from the West Indian islands were induced to settle on the lands in question; but they, too, were soon driven away by the Seminoles. In 1852, and at various times since, the PERRINE heirs have applied for a patent, and their venerable claim has been before Congress and the Department of the Interior; but that claim has never been confirmed by the Legislature, and no Secretary of the Interior, until now, has ventured to issue the patent.

It is said that especial pressure was brought to bear upon the Hon. HOKE SMITH when he was in charge of the Department of the Interior to induce him to befriend the PERRINE family by recommending the issue of the long desired patent; and that he declined to issue it for the extremely sensible reason that the family relations of the claimants were the White House would subject his action, if favorable, to unpleasant comment, if not to the charge of downright impropriety.

We are not at present examining the merits of the PERRINE claim. All of the facts about it are likely to come out now. As the case now stands, there does not seem to be any good reason, in the way of consideration rendered by the earlier PERRINES to the Government or to the general interests of mankind, why the actual settlers upon the extensive region in question should be turned out of houses and homes, and the property turned over to the PERRINES of the present generation, including Mrs. CLEVELAND's stepfather. But if the equitable right of the PERRINES to these thirty-six square miles of Florida lands was as clear as daylight, it would be nevertheless a grave question whether Mr. CLEVELAND's Administration, as Mr. CLEVELAND's Secretary of the Interior, and Mr. CLEVELAND's Assistant Attorney-General, could issue the patent which successive Administrations for more than half a century had declined to issue, without risking a scandal of serious magnitude.

On Monday, February 1, however, four weeks and two days before the end of Mr. CLEVELAND's term, the patent for the 28,000 acres went forth from the Interior Department to the clamorous PERRINES. It was issued by Land Commissioner LAMOREAUX at the instance of Secretary FRANCIS, recently appointed by Mr. CLEVELAND to fill the Cabinet office made vacant by Secretary HOKE SMITH's resignation; and the legal justification of the award was furnished by Assistant Attorney-General LIONHEIMER, also, we believe, a public officer of very recent appointment.

These public servants have been summoned to appear on Monday before the Senate Committee on Public Lands. The investigation should be thorough and impartial; and it should not be prejudiced either by the circumstance, on the one hand, that the inquiry may not be agreeable to the White House, or by the circumstance, on the other hand, that the rowdy TILMAN of South Carolina is manifesting considerable interest in the business. It is an unfortunate affair, but it cannot be shirked.

## An Extraordinary Judicial Utterance.

At the general election in 1895 a considerable addition was made to the number of Supreme Court Justices in this State, under the provisions of the new Constitution. Among the Justices thus elected was WILLIAM D. DICKY, of Newburgh, an active Republican politician, whose fitness for the position consisted chiefly in a creditable career as an officer of the Union army during the civil war, and his general obsequiousness as a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1894.

Although three Justices were chosen in the Second Judicial district, which includes Newburgh within its limits, Brooklyn, the principal city in the district, failed at that time to secure any representation on the Supreme Court bench, for DICKY ran ahead of HUGO HINCH of Brooklyn, a lawyer of more experience and ability. To make amends to Brooklyn, Justice DICKY has moved to that city with his son, who is in

the service of the State as the Justice's confidential clerk, and frequently occupies the bench with his father and aids him in the exercise of his patronage. The net Federal gain in compensation to the Justice and clerk by reason of this removal from Newburgh to the borough of Brooklyn is several thousand dollars a year, payable out of the public treasury. But then Brooklyn has gained a Justice. There were some benighted people who supposed that a good Justice could readily have been found among the many able Republican lawyers of Kings county, without having to import one in this manner. But it seems they were wrong.

To illustrate the kind of a Justice that Brooklyn has thus acquired, we would call attention to an extract from the charge of Mr. Justice DICKY to the jury in the case of JAMES MCGRATH, against the Flushing and College Point Electric Railway Company, which was tried some time ago at Long Island City.

The learned Justice began by saying: "GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY: The fact that I send this case to you for decision instead of taking it away from you is not to be interpreted by you as meaning that I consider that the plaintiff is entitled to recover. It means merely that I have such reliance upon jury that I am sending it to you to determine as a question of fact instead of deciding it myself, and taking it away from you."

It would be difficult to find a clearer example of judicial ignorance than is furnished by the second sentence of this charge. A Justice who supposes that the question of the issue of fact is a question of law, and that the jury or not depends upon his confidence or lack of confidence in juries—or his "reliance upon juries," as he puts it—should take a course of lectures in a law school without delay.

## Texas and Trusts.

For the benefit of a number of calm and thoughtful persons in this State, who are giving their waking hours and the best dreams of their sleep to the subject of trusts and the enormity of the same, we have imported from Austin, Tex., a copy of a devastating pamphlet, entitled "General Laws of the State of Texas, Passed at the Regular Session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature, Convened at the City of Austin, January 8, 1895, and Adjourned April 30, 1895." Trusts roused the wrath of Texas before they felt New York rising at them. Texas is a larger State than New York, and yet it has less business; and wherever business is slack there is an opportunity for men of powerful minds to come forward and insist that prosperous forms of business are an injury to the community, and should be restrained until they have ceased to be prosperous. The year 1895 was nowhere a year in which paper or even silver was found in large quantities outside of Populist platforms. Consequently the year 1895 was just the year in which a Legislature of Texas economists would struggle to repeal "a brand" of supply and demand, and to "brand" the supply and demand of the people's guileless or suspected of being guilty of doing a good business. At this point to import the fuzzy gray oracle hereinbefore described.

And at this moment, the moon being favorable, is opened, for the first time in New York, "an act to define trusts and to provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms, and associations of persons connected with them." A formidable title, but worthy of Texas and the subject. Nothing is better ascertained in the new political economy than that all corporations, persons, firms, and associations guilty of making money ought to be punished; and it is a truth accepted in Texas no less than in Georgia that a trust, whether prosperous or not, is the sum of all villainies. And what is this monster of so frightful mien? See "General Laws of Texas," p. 113:

"A trust is a combination of capital, skill, or force by two or more persons, firms, corporations, or associations of persons, or of two or more of them, for either any, or all, of certain purposes. Among these forbidden purposes is the purpose to increase or reduce the price of merchandise, produce, or commodities."

The Georgia law against trusts seems to be founded upon this interesting provision, which is getting imitated by the Legislatures of all appreciative States. Texas said, before Georgia had the honor to say, that as a trust was a thing abhorred, it was just as bad for it to put prices down as to put them up. In fact, a trust which seems to benefit the consumer by reducing the price of its product, is considered by all good judges to be the worst trust of all, a trust which saps the morals of the people and leads them to give up the noblest characteristic of many exalted minds in Texas, Georgia, New York, and Oklahoma.

Let the full enormity of trusts be understood here and now by everybody, in or out of Texas. To "reduce the price of merchandise, produce, or commodities" is an act which the Texas act to define trusts, or any other good statute for the same purpose, forbids with pains and penalties. It is not necessary to bother about the consumer. It is absolutely necessary to have a proper abomination of trusts, especially if you are a lawyer.

But even in Texas the rigidity of Populist political economy is allowed to bend to great occasions. There are kinds of trusts which the lawgiver will respect. There are combinations to increase the price of commodities which the lawgiver will encourage. Section twelve of this act in restraint of trusts provides that "this act shall not be held to apply to the producer or raiser of products in the hands of the producer or raiser; nor shall it be understood or construed to prevent the organization of laborers for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages." There can be a trust of farmers and cattlemen; there can be a trust of laborers. These privileged persons can combine to put up the prices of what they have to sell. The producers or sellers of other commodities will get into trouble if they enter into any such combination. For the benefit of trust-trackers in the State or anywhere else, be here repeated the solemn prohibitions of the collective wisdom of Texas against combinations not for the purpose of increasing the price of agricultural products or livestock or labor:

"If any person shall be or may become engaged in any combination of capital, skill, or force by two or more persons, firms, corporations, or associations of persons, or of two or more of them, for either any, or all, of the following purposes:

"1. To create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce, or to create or carry out any business authorized or permitted by the laws of this State.

"2. To increase or reduce the price of merchandise, produce, or commodities.

"3. To prevent competition in manufacture, making, transportation, sale, or purchase of merchandise, produce, or commodities, or to prevent competition in trade or commerce.

"4. To fix at any standard or figure, whereby its price to the public shall be in any manner controlled, or to create or carry out any business authorized or permitted by the laws of this State.

"5. To make, or enter into, or execute, or carry out any contract, obligation, or agreement of any kind or description, by which they shall be bound to themselves not to sell, dispose of, or transport any article or commodity, or article of trade, or any

standard figure, or by which they shall agree in any manner to keep the price of such article, commodity, or service at a fixed or graduated figure, or by which they shall in any manner establish or settle the price of any article or commodity or service, between them or themselves and others, to produce a free and unobstructed market, or to create or carry out any business authorized or permitted by the laws of this State, or by which they shall agree to pool, combine, or unite any interest they may have in connection with the sale, transportation, or distribution of any such article or commodity, or that its price may in any manner be affected; or aid or advise in the creation or carrying out of any such combination, or who shall as principal, manager, director, agent, servant, or employee, or in any other capacity, knowingly carry out any of the stipulations, purposes, prices, rates, directions, conditions, or orders of such combinations shall be punished by fine of not less than fifty nor more than five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment in the penitentiary not less than one nor more than ten years, or by either such fine or imprisonment. Each day during the violation of the provision shall constitute a separate offense."

And for the benefit of the world in general and in exhibition of the just and equal spirit of the legislation against those trusts which are thought not to have a majority of votes, this exception to the Texas act to define trusts is once more offered to a discriminating public:

"The provisions hereof shall be held cumulative of each other and of all other laws in any way affecting trusts, and shall not be held to apply to trusts and agricultural products in the hands of the producer or raiser, nor shall it be understood or construed to prevent the organization of laborers for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages."

It is with extreme diffidence that we venture to make a suggestion to a select assembly of the wise and good, but might not the present Legislature of Texas improve in one not vital, but interesting point this notable anti-trust law of 1895? Ought not the agriculturalists, livestock producers, and laborers of Texas to be forbidden by law to "reduce the price of merchandise, produce, or commodities"? No doubt it is very well to permit them to put up such price, but would it not be still better to prohibit them from putting such price down? A Texas Legislature cannot be too careful. Wisdom must be justified of all the children he may have in Texas.

## The Mugwump Heart.

If there is a stupid thing to be said, if views unrepresentative of true American sentiment are wanted, there is no man who can be relied upon more surely to fill the bill than the very respectable, deplorably dull, and utterly unimaginative and unsympathetic Mr. EVERETT P. WHEELER.

Evidently the Quill Club felt the need of representing hilarity optimism at its dinner on Tuesday evening, for it called in Brother WHEELER. The Quill Club, we believe, is an association of gentlemen of real and intelligent intellectual discernment, and like all clubs of this pretension, is probably afflicted with some Mugwumpism. Hence Brother WHEELER was brought in to put a damper on the cheerfulness of its dinner on Tuesday evening.

He did the damping in this wise, in the speech he made at the close of the feast, his subject being the "protection of American citizens abroad":

"The subject is an important and difficult one. We have not in many respects got back to the condition we were in prior to 1861. The war seems to have produced a new era, and there is now a certain lassitude and lack of interest among the people. We seem to have got a little tired of war. The American heart, it seems to me, is slow to respond, and is somewhat indifferent to the treatment of the American citizen abroad."

Of course, "we have not got back to the condition we were in prior to 1861," and, thank heaven, we shall not, and we cannot get back there; back to slavery and the exploded and subdued doctrine of the right of secession. What "relaxation" has the war produced, Brother WHEELER? Relaxation to what? This country has grown enormously in population and wealth since 1861. It is a vastly stronger country.

"Lassitude and lack of patriotism among our people!" Where do you find them? You will find them, of course, among your fellow Mugwumps, but they are nowhere else. The fervor of patriotism was never before so great among the American people as it is to-day. As a novelty, make the experiment of appealing to it, and you will find that for the first time you touch American sentiment and represent it. Instead of being a tiresome croaker, try for once to be spontaneous, discard artificiality, and express some real and vital feeling, and you will be surprised, everybody will be surprised, to see how much you are getting into sympathy with the people. We are no more tired of war now than we have been at any time before. Of course, the American people do not want war. They have never wanted it for the fun of fighting; but they are not afraid of it. They are a people among whom the martial spirit is pervasive, and it was never stronger than it is now. It is not the cockney "jingo" spirit about which the pusillanimous Mugwumps talk so much, for we are not an aggressive people. We mind our own business. We are not grabbing after territory or seeking to aggrandize ourselves by browbeating the weak and defenseless; but the knowledge of arms and military drill was never so widespread among the people as now. Schools and colleges have military drill, even the religious schools; and in due time Congress will pass a law setting apart commissioned and non-commissioned officers to be detailed as such instructors for the millions of boys in the public schools.

A vast deal more than you know of is happening here, Brother WHEELER. The American heart is beating normally, however slow and cold may be your own. For instance, it beats in warm sympathy with the suffering Cubans, struggling to throw off the brutal and barbarous Spanish yoke, though your own heart is unaffected by the outrages committed against that brave people at our very doors. The American heart is not indifferent to the injury inflicted on Americans and American interests by Spain's atrocious war upon Cuba. It is hot with indignation and resentment. Mr. WHEELER would have us interfere in behalf of the far-away Armenians against Turkish savagery, with which only Christian Europe can deal effectively; but he is indifferent to the destruction of Cuba, an American island close by our shores. The only reflection in this country is that of which he himself is the foremost representative.

A Last Chance for Congress.

Only a fortnight remains of the session of Congress, and still nothing is on record to show how its members now regard the struggle in Cuba.

It is consideration for Spain that prompts this delay. Surely the history of her dealings with America does not call for such consideration. She has allowed one after another of her colonies in this hemisphere, until only Cuba and Porto Rico are left. If Congress should acknowledge that Cuba has now, in her turn, achieved independence, what would this be but following the uniform course of history?

The real question for Congress is whether it will see two years of war prolonged perhaps to ten, as in the former contest. Mr.

CLEVELAND and Mr. OLNEY rivaled each other last December in depicting the devastation which the struggle had already wrought. The former told Congress that both parties were acting on the theory that "the exigencies of the contest require the wholesale annihilation of property," that the industrial value of the island, without a speedy change, would "soon disappear altogether," that as to its restoration, in that case, "it is extremely doubtful if capital can be induced even to make the attempt." Thus we had "the spectacle of the utter ruin of an adjoining country, by nature one of the most charming and fertile in the world."

Mr. CLEVELAND went further. He declared that the conduct of Spain in the war which began with the rising at Yara in 1895, had been such as to test the forbearance of the United States, "the most pacific of powers," and that no other great country "would have manifested the same restraint and the same patient endurance." In like manner the Government and the people of the United States saw that "conceded grievances had led to the present revolt." The proximity of Cuba, "hardly separated from our territory," our investments there, from \$80,000,000 to \$50,000,000, and our annual trade with the island, amounting to about \$108,000,000 in 1895 and to nearly \$98,000,000 the following year, have all caused us to have "inextricable entanglements with the rebellion," a long going on.

What could the ordinary reader of such statements suppose that they led up to? Would he be surprised to find Mr. CLEVELAND announcing that he had concluded to act on the resolution almost unanimously adopted by Congress last year, "That the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba"? Mr. CLEVELAND himself says that there is reason to believe that "the insurgents have gained in point of numbers and character and resources, and are none the less inflexible in their resolve not to succumb without practically securing the great objects for which they took up arms."

Yet, after all this prelude, he proposes not to acknowledge the independence, or even the belligerency, of the patriots, but to negotiate with Madrid for bringing them back under the detested yoke of Spain. And in these last days of its existence Congress sees what that policy has amounted to. Secretary OLNEY, in his report to the President, had stated as strongly the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

## THE RAID ON CAPITAL AND INVESTMENTS.

There has been no subject of popular discussion within a decade in respect of which there has been such a comprehensive and vicious effort to deceive the public as that now manifested in the agitation for cheaper gas in this city. This agitation is a natural incident of a general Populist menace to the value of property in the State and city, and in so far as it recalls the gas industry it is fitting that the facts should be set forth clearly in the general public interest. This we do in a natural sequence, in the form of question and answer:

Q.—Is there any popular demand in this city for a reduction in the price of gas? A.—Not a single person has any complaint about the quality of gas furnished? A.—None.

Q.—Has there been any organization of citizens formed, public meetings held, or petitions signed in support of these so-called reforms? A.—None.

Q.—Who, then, is making all the talk about the matter? A.—Two sensational newspapers.

Q.—What is their object? A.—To advertise themselves.

Q.—Have they any other reason? A.—They are hostile at all times to corporate interests, and their fundamental doctrines are those of envy, turbulence, and anarchy. They are the enemies of the industries, and the prudent should divide their savings with the lazy, the improvident, and the vile; and they assume to believe that the Legislature of New York is as ignorant as that of Kansas and as infamous as the Common Council of Chicago.

Q.—What is the legal price of gas in this city? A.—One dollar and twenty-five cents per thousand cubic feet.

Q.—Does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—How does it sell for less elsewhere? A.—It sells for \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

Q.—Why does it sell for more here? A.—Because the gas here is better and costs more to manufacture and distribute.

Q.—Give details. A.—The candle power legally required here for gas is twenty. The gas actually furnished varies between twenty and thirty-four candle power. The gas is far below this grade in Philadelphia and the other cheap gas cities. In Philadelphia the only rival to the city gas is a little higher in Chicago, but varies greatly there, and is not nearly so good as in New York. The same is true of Boston.

Q.—Give more details. A.—In Philadelphia most of the gas is made by the cheap and old-fashioned method of extraction from bituminous coal. In New York the gas is made by the process is used. In Philadelphia the gas properties are owned by the city and are free from taxation; they derive a large income from the sale of coke and the other by-products obtained in the manufacture of the gas, which income at New York is \$1 in Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities.

receives elsewhere. The value of the property owned by the gas companies has, of course, shared in the natural increase in the value of all property in the city, but to deprive the companies of this increased value by a reduction in the price of gas to an unprofitable figure would be to enact a principle of confiscation impugning every vested interest and property right in New York State.

Q.—It is said that the owners of these stocks and bonds are mostly millionaires. Is not the crime of owning property, even millionaires have rights that the public are bound to respect; but, in fact, the stock of the gas companies of this city is divided to a greater extent into small holdings than that of all other corporations. The average holding is less than one hundred shares.

Q.—What does this indicate? A.—That the stock of the companies is owned not speculatively, but for permanent investment, by people of small means who have placed their savings there, trusting in the sobriety and conservatism of law in New York State.